

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 11 and 16 are cancelled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1-10, 12-15, and 17-20 are pending. Claims 1, 3-5, and 13-15 are amended. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 5 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Amendment reduces the issues on appeal by placing the claims in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and by canceling claims 11 and 16. This Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that the Examiner has just now presented new grounds for rejection in this Final Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has acknowledged receipt of an Abstract of JP 10-512805.

Restriction Requirement Withdrawn

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has withdrawn the Restriction Requirement and has examined each of claims 1-20.

Amendments to the Specification

In order to overcome the Examiner objection to the specification, paragraph [0003] of the specification has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, the Applicants have amended claim 1 and have cancelled claim 11 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-14, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. (U.S. 6,216,660) in view of Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363);

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. (U.S. 6,216,660) and Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363) as applied to Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-14 and 16-17 above, and further in view of Wernholm et al. (U.S. 6,692,551);

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. (U.S. 6,216,660) and Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363) as applied to claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-14 and 16-17 above, and further in view of Keller (U.S. 2,635,858);

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. (U.S. 6,216,660) and Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363) as applied to claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-14 and 16-17 above, and further in view of Busch et al. (U.S. 2001/0052410);

Claims 1-2, 6-9, 11-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toriyama et al. (U.S. 6,218,804) in view of Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363);

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toriyama et al. (U.S. 6,218,804) and Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363) as applied to claims 1-2, 6-9, 11-13 and 16-17 above, and further in view of Busch et al. (U.S. 2001/0052410);

Claim 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. (U.S. 6,216,660) in view of Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363);

Claim 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toriyama et al. (U.S. 6,218,804) in view of Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363);

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. (U.S. 6,216,660) in view of Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363) and Keller (U.S. 2,635,858);

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holben (U.S. 2,680,601) in view of Poles et al. (U.S. 2001/0021363).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amendments to Independent Claims 1, 3, 4, and 5

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the present application, independent claim 1 has been amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to an atmospheric pollutant treatment structure, including *inter alia*

wherein the shroud is attached to a front end of a cylinder head in a position that is forward of an outer end of an ignition plug.

In addition, each of independent claims 3-5 has been amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to an atmospheric pollutant treatment structure, including *inter alia*

wherein the shroud is attached to the cylinder head in a position that is forward of an outer end of an ignition plug.

Support for the novel combination of elements set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 3-5 can be seen in FIG. 2.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claim 1 and 3 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Ryu et al., Toriyama et al., Poles et al., Keller, and Holben.

In contrast to the present invention, FIG. 2 of Ryu et al. merely discloses a ignition plug piercing through shroud 69.

Further, as can be seen in Toriyama et al. FIG. 5, this document merely discloses an ignition plug 206 extending further forward than the shroud 207.

Poles et al. were cited merely to disclose a catalyst.

In the rejection of claim 4, Keller was cited merely to disclose a vibration damping means.

In the rejection of claim 5, Holben was cited merely to disclose tabs and recesses.

However, no combination of Ryu et al., Toriyama et al., Poles et al., Keller, and Holben can teach or suggest "wherein the shroud is attached to the cylinder head in a position that is forward of an outer end of an ignition plug", as required by each of claims 1 and 3-5.

At least for the reasons described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 3 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Ryu et al., Toriyama et al., Poles et al., Keller, and Holben.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 3-5 are in condition for allowance.

*Application No. 10/688,927
Amendment dated July 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action of April 23, 2007*

*Docket No. 0505-1250PUS1
Art Unit: 3747
Page 13 of 14*

Dependent Claims

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 11 and 16 have been cancelled, and claims 13-15 have been amended to depend from claim 1. All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, as well as for the additional novel limitations set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

*Application No. 10/688,927
Amendment dated July 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action of April 23, 2007*

*Docket No. 0505-1250PUS1
Art Unit: 3747
Page 14 of 14*

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.


All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030 (Direct Line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

July 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
James M. Slattery
Reg. No. 28,380
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JMS/CTT/ktp